

# ● PRINTER RUSH ●

(PTO ASSISTANCE)

Application: <u>10106040</u>	Examiner: <u>Stackton</u>	GAU: <u>11626</u>	
From: <u>MW</u>	Location: <u>IDC</u> FMF FDC	Date: <u>8/4/05</u>	
Tracking #: <u>0607219</u>		Week Date: <u>5/16/05</u>	

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

DOC CODE	DOC DATE	MISCELLANEOUS
<input type="checkbox"/> 1449		<input type="checkbox"/> Continuing Data
<input type="checkbox"/> IDS		<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLM	<u>3-8-2005</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Document Legibility
<input type="checkbox"/> IIFW		<input type="checkbox"/> Fees
<input type="checkbox"/> SRFW		<input type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> DRW		
<input type="checkbox"/> OATH		
<input type="checkbox"/> 312		
<input type="checkbox"/> SPEC		

[RUSH] MESSAGE:

① Claim 7 (original 9) depends on non-existent claim 86. Please advise.

Thanks

[XRUSH] RESPONSE: In the amendment filed March 8, 2005, the dependency of claim 9 (now renumbered claim 7) was changed from "claim 8" to "claim 6". Although very light, there is ~~definitely~~ definitely a dash mark through the "8" in claim 9. Therefore, claim 9 depends from claim 6, not claim 86. Also see Applicant's Remarks section (attached).

8/11/05

INITIALS: SS

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.  
REV 10/04